

60,130-1290  
OOMRA0120REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Applicant has amended claims 1, 6, and 11 and cancelled claims 5 and 21. New claims 22-30 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 6-20, and 22-30 are currently pending.

Formal issues

The Office Action objected to the specification because of an informality. Applicant has corrected the informality helpfully noted by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the objection is therefore respectfully requested.

§ 112 rejection

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has amended claim 6 to obviate the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

§ 102 rejection

Claims 1-3, 5-12, and 16-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,037,145 to Wilkes ("Wilkes"). Applicant has cancelled claims 5 and 21 without prejudice, rendering the rejection of those claims moot. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection with respect to the remaining claims.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the elements of claims 5 and 21. Contrary to the Office Action's assertion, Wilkes does not show an actuator that drives the output member in a single direction to obtain different output positions of the output member. Wilkes does teach a motor 452 that can shift a clutch element into a superlocked position. However, unlike the invention, Wilkes requires the motor to be driven in different directions to obtain different output positions. More particularly, Wilkes teaches power locking and superlocking a latch by driving the motor 452 to draw dogs 436 inward until they stall the motor by reaching the innermost end of the slots in which they move. The slider 424 retracts to a superlocked condition, preventing manual override of the latches (col. 7, lines 11-52).

60,130-1290  
OOMRA0120

Note that although the motor 452 is driven in the same direction to cause the linkage to go from an unlocked to a locked condition and also from the locked condition to the superlocked condition, the slider 424 itself, which the Office Action asserts is the same as the claimed output member, does not change output positions between the locked and superlocked positions, as shown in Figures 4b and 4c.

To free the latches from the superlocking position, the motor 452 is driven in reverse. In other words, Wilkes teaches driving the motor in two opposite directions, one to move the slider 424 to a locked/superlocked position and another to move the slider 424 to an unlocked position. The claimed invention, by contrast, drives the motor in a single direction to obtain different output positions of an output member. Because Wilkes only recognizes driving the motor in two directions and not a single direction to move an output member into different output positions, Wilkes fails to disclose or suggest claims 1-3, 6-12, and 16-20. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### § 103 rejection

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilkes in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,722,272 to Bridgeman et al. ("Bridgeman"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 4 depends indirectly on patentable claim 1 and is therefore patentable for the reasons explained above. Adding Bridgeman to Wilkes still fails to teach the claimed invention because Bridgeman does not even discuss the drive direction of the motor powering the door latch. The Office Action therefore fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 4, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicant has added new claims 22-30 to claim the invention more particularly. New claim 22 recites a shuttle that is axially fast on the output member, combining the elements of original claims 1 and 7. Although the Office Action asserted that Figure 5 shows the subject matter of claim 7, it is clear from Figure 5 that the shaft 524 is not axially fast with the peg 536.

New claim 23 combines the elements of original claims 1 and 4. Although the Office Action asserted that it would have been obvious to incorporate a centrifugal clutch into the Wilkes latching mechanism, there is no motivation for this combination because adding a centrifugal clutch would render the superlocking action of the motor in Wilkes inoperative. More

60,130-1290  
00MRA0120

particularly, a centrifugal clutch would defeat the blocking action of the motor and thereby compromise the superlocking function as taught by Wilkes.

New claim 24 incorporates elements recited in claim 13, which the Office Action indicated was allowable. Further, claims 25-30 are allowable for the reasons explained above. Entry and allowance of new claims 22-30 are therefore respectfully requested.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. The Commissioner is authorized to charge \$236 to Deposit Account No. 50-1482, in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds, P.C. for seven additional claims in excess of 20 (\$126) and a one-month extension (\$110). Applicant believes that no additional fees are necessary, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482 in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,



Anna M. Shih, Reg. No. 36,372  
Carlson, Gaskey & Olds  
400 W. Maple Road, Ste. 350  
Birmingham, MI 48009  
(248) 988-8360

Dated: July 23, 2003

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, TC 3600, Before Final, (703) 872-9326, on July 23, 2003.



Beth A. Beard

FAX RECEIVED

JUL 24 2003

GROUP 3600

Official

Official

FAX RECEIVED

JUL 23 2003

GROUP 3600